

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/522,808		<b>Applicant(s)</b> MOLYNEAUX ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Tiffany A Fetzner		<b>Art Unit</b> 2859	

**All Participants:** (1) Tiffany A Fetzner. (2) James S. Parker Reg. No. 40,119.

**Status of Application:** Amended

(3) \_\_\_\_\_. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 31 August 2004 **Time:** 4:30pm

**Type of Interview:**  
☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No  
 If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:  
*Su et al., reference 6,493,572 B1 and applicant's July 14th 2004 declaration*

Claims discussed:  
*all pending independent claims and dependent claim 11.*

Prior art documents discussed:  
*Su et al., Sakakura, Mcdougall et al.,*

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:  
*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted applicant's representative to discuss the applicant's July 14th 2004 declaration, because it was not clear from exhibit A that the top and lower coils comprising the single and paired coils, shown separately, comprise applicant's invention when viewed together. Because the declaration is okay the Su et al., reference is no longer being applied as prior art against the claims. The examiner also requested permission to make an examiner's amendment to claims 1, 38, 41, 51, 78, and dependent claim 11 in order to correct grammatical errors, clarify the meaning of the term "outside" with respect to the claimed coil structure in dependent claim 11 to avoid confusion, and clarify that all of the coils which comprise applicant's pair of coils, and applicant's single coil are RF coils. The applicant's attorney approved the examiner's Amendment and thanked the examiner for her time..